Refusal to accept cheques for voluntary advance deposits by Telephone subscribers

839. SHRI MOHD. KHALEELUR RAHMAN: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Accounts Department of the Office of the Area Manager (South), Nehru Place Exchange, New Delhi which has been accepting cheques for voluntary advance deposits by the Telephone subscribers till the end of last year, suddenly refused to accept the same towards the end of January this year and the Accounts Officer (S) gave remarks on the Demand Note Cash only;

(b) if so, under what authority or order the Accounts Officer (S) acted, thus causing considerable harassment particularly to the aged widows concerned who had to carry cash;

(c) whether even after the remittance of cash voluntary advance deposits, the Accounts Officer (S) disconnected some Phones in '63' level Exchange, for alleged non-payment of the Bill irrespective of the fact that sufficient amount was lying at the credit of the party concerned; and

(d) the action Government propose to take against the officials involved and the steps proposed to be taken to bring down such incidents in future?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA): (a) The payment of deposits raised through demand notes is usually accepted in Cash/through Demand Draft only. However, in exceptional cases, on the request of subscribers, cheques are also accepted, but follow up action for adjustment of and accounting for, the deposits is taken on realisation of the proceeds on the cheques.

(b) As stated above the normal accepted practice is to accept payment in Cash/through Demand Draft.

(c) There was one single instance of this nature, and suitable disciplinary action has been taken against the delinquent officer.

(d) To avoid recurrence of such cases, instructions regarding feeding of data to the computer promptly after receipt of voluntary deposits have been reiterated, and, as indicated above, exemplary action taken against the errant officer.

Mobile Civil Emergency Force

840. SHRI MOHD. KHALEELUR RAHMAN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Mobile Civil Emergency Force (MCEF), Delhi has been wound up w.e.f. 7th September, 1989;

(b) if so, whether employees of the erstwhile organisation had been asked to exercise option in the matter of their absorption in some other organisation or to be sent to the Central Surplus Cell at the time of winding up of the MCEF; and

(c) if the reply to part (b) above be in the negative, what are the reasons therefor and whether Government propose to obtain options from the employees in view of the Department of Personnel revised Order dated 1st April, 1989 under which condition of six months for absorption/re-employment through Central Surplus Cell has been dispensed with?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SUBODH KANT SAHAY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) At the time of formal winding up of MCEF, such of the employees of the MCEF who did not exercise their option to join the CISF were sent to the Central Surplus Cell for redeployment in terms of the interim order of the Supreme Court dated

15-5-89. The options have already been exercised by the employees and action thereon has been taken in accordance with the orders passed by the Supreme Court.

(c) Does not arise.

Security Money for Installation of New Telephone Connections by Delhi Telephone Nigam

841. SHRIMATI MANORAMA PADNEY: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Delhi charge Rs. 1980/- as security money from the customers at the time of installation of new telephone connections;

(b) if so, since when this security is being charged and the reasons therefor;

(c) whether this security is not being charged from the old subscribers;

(d) whether any interest on this security is paid to the subscribers, if so, the rate thereof;

(e) if the reply to part (d) above be in the negative, the reasons therefor; and

(f) whether a copy of the rules and regulation in this connection be laid on the Table of the House?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA): (a) On sanctioning of a telephone, all subscribers in non-OYT categories in Delhi as elsewhere in the country are required to pay advance of one year's rental plus bi-monthly rental as per provisions contained in the Indian Telegraph Rules. The present rate of bi-monthly rental is Rs. 330/- and thus it comes to Rs. 1980/- for a year. According the amount of deposit of Rs. 1000 received at the time of making an application plus interest accrued thereon is adjusted towards the same.

(b) and (c) One year's advance rental is being charged from all the subscribers since 1-1-1968. It is as per Indian Telegraph Rules.

(d) and (e) No interest is being given to the subscriber on this Advance Rental as a matter of policy.

(f) Extract copy of relevant Rules is enclosed as statement.

Statement

Extract from Para 215 of P & T Manual Vol. XIV.

(2) One year's advance rental from non-OYT subscribers in M/R exchanges.

All the non-OYT telephone subscribers who get the telephone connection in Measured Rate area on or after 1st January 1968, are required to pay in addition to the advance of one quarter's rent, advance of one year's rental applicable to the station concerned before the telephone connection is provided. In the case of Government subscribers the payment of the rental of one year in addition to the quarterly rental in advance need not be insisted upon before provision of the connection but the same should be billed for and recovered subsequently by the billing authority on receipt of information regarding installation of the telephone. The advance rental for one year thus recovered will not be adjusted against any bill during the currency of the telephone. However, when the telephone is closed, the advance rental will be refunded to the subscriber after adjustment of any dues from him.